



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,553	02/15/2001	Hirotsugu Satoh	R2184.0095/P095	9369
24998	7590	02/09/2005	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP			YIGDALL, MICHAEL J	
2101 L Street, NW			ART UNIT	
Washington, DC 20037			PAPER NUMBER	
			2122	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/783,553	Applicant(s) SATO, HIROTSUGU	
	Examiner Michael J. Yigdal	Art Unit 2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 29, 2004 has been entered. Claims 1-6 are now pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specifically, Applicant contends that none of Mochizuki, Otsuka and Shaw discloses or suggests the newly added limitation, "wherein said updated software is stored first in said memory device of said computer, and subsequently in said optical recording medium" (Applicant's remarks, pages 5-6).

However, Tognazzini, art now made of record, discloses an optical recording medium that includes pre-recorded information as well as supplemental information written later (see, for example, column 2, lines 8-17). The supplemental information may be in the form of updates that are written to the optical recording medium through a computer (see, for example, column 5, lines 11-18). Such information is stored first in a memory device of the computer, and subsequently in the optical recording medium (see, for example, column 6, lines 8-17).

Art Unit: 2122

3. In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references (Applicant's remarks, page 6), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Mochizuki discloses an optical recording medium for distributing software (see, for example, column 5, lines 15-21). Mochizuki also discloses an authentication procedure for reproducing the software (see, for example, steps S1, S4, S8 and S9 in FIG. 4), but does not expressly disclose applying the authentication procedure for rewriting and updating the software. Shaw, however, discloses an authentication procedure for rewriting and updating software (see, for example, column 4, lines 13-18 and 34-49).

Likewise, Mochizuki discloses that the optical recording medium is readable and writable (see, for example, column 9, line 56 to column 10, line 8), but does not expressly disclose storing the updated software in the optical recording medium. Tognazzini, however, discloses a similar readable and writable optical recording medium that does, in fact, store the updates (see, for example, column 5, lines 11-18).

The combination of Mochizuki, Shaw and Tognazzini would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Shaw suggests that the updates can be applied securely by performing integrity tests and confirming that the update is trustworthy (see, for example, column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 10). Tognazzini suggests that the updates can be applied periodically to an

Art Unit: 2122

optical recording medium that was pre-recorded with original information (see, for example, column 5, lines 11-18). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to supplement the software distribution system of Mochizuki with such features.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,097,814 to Mochizuki (art of record, "Mochizuki") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,094,723 to Tognazzini (art made of record, "Tognazzini").

With respect to claim 1 (currently amended), Mochizuki discloses an optical recording medium that is computer-readable and -writable (see, for example, column 5, lines 15-21, which shows a computer-readable optical recording medium, and column 9, line 56 to column 10, line 8, which shows that the medium is writable), which medium stores software to be distributed, non-rewritable inherent ID information (see, for example, column 5, lines 29-35, which shows that the medium stores software to be distributed and inherent ID information, and column 5, lines 56-67, which shows that the ID is permanent or non-rewritable), and a transmission program for transmitting the inherent ID information to a software distributor via a

Art Unit: 2122

communication device (see, for example, steps S1 and S4 in FIG. 4, and column 7, lines 3-10, which shows that the ID stored on the medium is transmitted to a software distributor).

Mochizuki does not expressly disclose the limitation wherein the medium stores a program for causing updated software to be stored in a memory device of a computer and in said optical recording medium, and wherein said updated software is stored first in said memory device of said computer, and subsequently in said optical recording medium.

However, Tognazzini similarly discloses an optical recording medium that is computer-readable and -writable (see, for example, column 2, lines 8-17). Tognazzini further discloses that updates may be applied to the pre-recorded information stored in the optical recording medium by downloading the updates to the medium through a computer (see, for example, column 5, lines 11-18). Such information is stored first in a memory device of the computer, and subsequently in the optical recording medium (see, for example, column 6, lines 8-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the system of Mochizuki with a program for causing updated software to be stored in a memory device of a computer and in said optical recording medium, wherein said updated software is stored first in said memory device of said computer, and subsequently in said optical recording medium, such as taught by Tognazzini. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the ability to update a pre-recorded optical recording medium.

With respect to claim 4 (previously presented), Mochizuki also discloses storing a computer information acquiring program for acquiring information of said computer (see, for example, column 6, lines 17-30, which shows obtaining a drive ID from the reproduction

Art Unit: 2122

apparatus that is using the medium), wherein the transmission program transmits the information of the computer, as well as the inherent ID information, to the software distributor (see, for example, steps S1, S2 and S4 in FIG. 4, and column 7, lines 3-10, which shows transmitting the inherent ID of the medium and the drive ID or information of the computer to the software distributor).

6. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mochizuki in view of Tognazzini in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,381,741 to Shaw (art of record, "Shaw").

With respect to claim 2 (previously presented), Mochizuki discloses an optical recording medium that is computer-readable and -writable (see, for example, column 5, lines 15-21, which shows a computer-readable optical recording medium, and column 9, line 56 to column 10, line 8, which shows that the medium is writable), which medium stores software to be distributed and non-rewritable inherent ID information (see, for example, column 5, lines 29-35, which shows that the medium stores software to be distributed and inherent ID information, and column 5, lines 56-67, which shows that the ID is permanent or non-rewritable).

Although Mochizuki discloses reproducing the software based on an authentication judgment result of the inherent ID information (see, for example, steps S1, S4, S8 and S9 in FIG. 4), Mochizuki does not expressly disclose a software updating program for rewriting and updating the software in accordance with update software transmitted from a software distributor via a communication device based on an authentication judgment result of the inherent ID information.

Art Unit: 2122

However, Shaw discloses an updater or updating program (see, for example, column 4, lines 44-49) for rewriting and updating software with updated code transmitted from a distributor (see, for example, column 5, lines 3-13), based on an authentication judgment result (see, for example, column 4, lines 34-42, which shows comparing a digital signature before beginning the update), after first transmitting ID information (see, for example, column 4, lines 13-18). Shaw further discloses that the updating program securely updates the data by performing integrity tests and confirming that the update is trustworthy (see, for example, column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the system of Mochizuki with a program for rewriting and updating the software in accordance with update software transmitted from a software distributor via a communication device based on an authentication judgment result of the inherent ID information, such as taught by Shaw. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the ability to securely update the software by performing integrity tests and confirming that the update is trustworthy.

Mochizuki in view of Shaw does not expressly disclose the limitation wherein the software updating program is for causing updated software to be stored in a memory device of a computer and in said optical recording medium.

However, Tognazzini similarly discloses an optical recording medium that is computer-readable and -writable (see, for example, column 2, lines 8-17). Tognazzini further discloses that updates may be applied to the pre-recorded information stored in the optical recording medium

Art Unit: 2122

by downloading the updates to the medium through a computer (see, for example, column 5, lines 11-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the system of Mochizuki and Shaw with a program for causing updated software to be stored in a memory device of a computer and in said optical recording medium, such as taught by Tognazzini. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the ability to update a pre-recorded optical recording medium.

With respect to claim 3 (currently amended), Mochizuki discloses an optical recording medium that is computer-readable and -writable (see, for example, column 5, lines 15-21, which shows a computer-readable optical recording medium, and column 9, line 56 to column 10, line 8, which shows that the medium is writable), which medium stores software to be distributed, non-rewritable inherent ID information (see, for example, column 5, lines 29-35, which shows that the medium stores software to be distributed and inherent ID information, and column 5, lines 56-67, which shows that the ID is permanent or non-rewritable), and a transmission program for transmitting the inherent ID information to a software distributor via a communication device (see, for example, steps S1 and S4 in FIG. 4, and column 7, lines 3-10, which shows that the ID stored on the medium is transmitted to a software distributor).

Although Mochizuki discloses reproducing the software based on an authentication judgment result of the inherent ID information (see, for example, steps S1, S4, S8 and S9 in FIG. 4), Mochizuki does not expressly disclose a software updating program of rewriting and updating the software in accordance with update software transmitted from the software distributor via the

Art Unit: 2122

communication device based on an authentication judgment result of the inherent ID information.

However, Shaw discloses an updater or updating program (see, for example, column 4, lines 44-49) for rewriting and updating software with updated code transmitted from a distributor (see, for example, column 5, lines 3-13), based on an authentication judgment result (see, for example, column 4, lines 34-42, which shows comparing a digital signature before beginning the update), after first transmitting ID information (see, for example, column 4, lines 13-18). Shaw further discloses that the updating program securely updates the data by performing integrity tests and confirming that the update is trustworthy (see, for example, column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the system of Mochizuki with a program for rewriting and updating the software in accordance with update software transmitted from a software distributor via a communication device based on an authentication judgment result of the inherent ID information, such as taught by Shaw. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the ability to securely update the software by performing integrity tests and confirming that the update is trustworthy.

Mochizuki in view of Shaw does not expressly disclose the limitation wherein the software updating program is for causing updated software to be stored in a memory device of a computer and in said optical recording medium, wherein said updated software is stored first in said memory device of said computer, and subsequently in said optical recording medium.

However, Tognazzini similarly discloses an optical recording medium that is computer-readable and -writable (see, for example, column 2, lines 8-17). Tognazzini further discloses that updates may be applied to the pre-recorded information stored in the optical recording medium by downloading the updates to the medium through a computer (see, for example, column 5, lines 11-18). Such information is stored first in a memory device of the computer, and subsequently in the optical recording medium (see, for example, column 6, lines 8-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the system of Mochizuki and Shaw with a program for causing updated software to be stored in a memory device of a computer and in said optical recording medium, wherein said updated software is stored first in said memory device of said computer, and subsequently in said optical recording medium, such as taught by Tognazzini. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the ability to update a pre-recorded optical recording medium.

With respect to claim 5 (currently amended), Mochizuki discloses software distributed and stored in a computer-readable and -writable optical recording medium (see, for example, column 5, lines 15-21, which shows software distributed and stored in a computer-readable optical recording medium, and column 9, line 56 to column 10, line 8, which shows that the medium is writable).

Although Mochizuki discloses a method for reproducing software (see, for example, the title and abstract), Mochizuki does not expressly disclose a method of updating software. However, Shaw discloses a method of upgrading or updating software (see, for example, the title and abstract).

Mochizuki also discloses transmitting non-rewritable inherent ID information to a software distributor via a communication device (see, for example, steps S1 and S4 in FIG. 4, and column 7, lines 3-10, which shows that the ID stored on the medium is transmitted to a software distributor).

Although Mochizuki discloses reproducing the software based on an authentication judgment result of the inherent ID information (see, for example, steps S1, S4, S8 and S9 in FIG. 4), Mochizuki does not expressly disclose rewriting and updating the software in accordance with update software transmitted from the software distributor via the communication device based on an authentication judgment result of the inherent ID information.

However, Shaw discloses an updater or updating program (see, for example, column 4, lines 44-49) for rewriting and updating software with updated code transmitted from a distributor (see, for example, column 5, lines 3-13), based on an authentication judgment result (see, for example, column 4, lines 34-42, which shows comparing a digital signature before beginning the update), after first transmitting ID information (see, for example, column 4, lines 13-18). Shaw further discloses that the updating program securely updates the data by performing integrity tests and confirming that the update is trustworthy (see, for example, column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the method of Mochizuki with the step of rewriting and updating the software in accordance with update software transmitted from a software distributor via a communication device based on an authentication judgment result of the inherent ID information, such as taught by Shaw. The modification would have been obvious because one of

Art Unit: 2122

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the ability to securely update the software by performing integrity tests and confirming that the update is trustworthy.

Mochizuki in view of Shaw does not expressly disclose updating software in the computer-readable and -writable optical recording medium and in a memory device of a computer that is currently using the computer-readable and -writable optical recording medium, wherein said updated software is stored first in said memory device of said computer, and subsequently in said optical recording medium.

However, Tognazzini similarly discloses an optical recording medium that is computer-readable and -writable (see, for example, column 2, lines 8-17). Tognazzini further discloses that updates may be applied to the pre-recorded information stored in the optical recording medium by downloading the updates to the medium through a computer (see, for example, column 5, lines 11-18). Such information is stored first in a memory device of the computer, and subsequently in the optical recording medium (see, for example, column 6, lines 8-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the method of Mochizuki and Shaw with the step of updating software in the computer-readable and -writable optical recording medium and in a memory device of a computer that is currently using the computer-readable and -writable optical recording medium, wherein said updated software is stored first in said memory device of said computer, and subsequently in said optical recording medium, such as taught by Tognazzini. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the ability to update a pre-recorded optical recording medium.

Art Unit: 2122

With respect to claim 6 (new), Tognazzini further discloses the limitation wherein said updated software is stored first in said memory device of said computer, and subsequently in said optical recording medium (see, for example, column 6, lines 8-17).

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Yigdall whose telephone number is (571) 272-3707. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MY

Michael J. Yigdall
Examiner
Art Unit 2122

mjy


TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER